

# PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

To:  
**PARK Jang-Won**  
 Jewoo Bldg. 5th Floor, 200,  
 Nonhyun-Dong, Gangnam-Gu  
 135-010 Seoul  
 Republic of Korea

**PCT**

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

		Date of mailing (day/month/year)      3 February 2005 (03.02.2005)
Applicant's or agent's file reference <b>PALGE04297</b>		<b>FOR FURTHER ACTION</b> See paragraph 2 below
International application No. <b>PCT/KR 2004/002373</b>	International filing date (day/month/year) <b>16 September 2004 (16.09.2004)</b>	Priority Date (day/month/year) <b>23 October 2003 (23.10.2003)</b>
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC <b>F24F 1/02</b>		
Applicant <b>LG ELECTRONICS INC.</b>		

**1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:**

- Cont. No. I      Basis of the opinion
- Cont. No. II      Priority
- Cont. No. III      Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- Cont. No. IV      Lack of unity of invention
- Cont. No. V      Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- Cont. No. VI      Certain documents cited
- Cont. No. VII      Certain defects in the international application
- Cont. No. VIII      Certain observations on the international application

**2. FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

**3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.**

Name and mailing address of the ISA/ AT <b>Austrian Patent Office</b> <b>Dresdner Straße 87, A-1200 Vienna</b>  Facsimile No. +43 / 1 / 534 24 / 535	Authorized officer <b>LOSENICKY G.</b>  Telephone No. +43 / 1 / 534 24 / 372
--	---

**Continuation No. I**

**Basis of the opinion**

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed.

**Continuation No. V**

**Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement**

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims ----	YES
	Claims 1-8	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims ----	YES
	Claims 1-8	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims 1-8	YES
	Claims ----	NO

2. Citations and explanations:

The following documents have been cited in the Search Report:

- D1: US 6 272 878 B1; (CHANG); 14-08-2001  
D2: US 3 811 293 A; (FLYNN); 21-05-1974  
D3: JP 59-074439 A; (MATSUSHITA); 26-04-1984  
D4: JP 10-068535 A; (SHARP); 10-03-1998

The present invention does not satisfy the criterion set forth in Article 33 (2) PCT because the subject-matter of Claims 1-8 is not new in respect of the prior art as defined in the regulations (Rule 64 (1) PCT).

The above mentioned documents disclose a window type air conditioner comprising a case, an indoor and an outdoor heat exchanger each of said heat exchanger having a fan. The suction ports for the outdoor unit are placed on the lateral surface of the case and the outdoor fan is installed in a shroud. Said fan further comprises a water dispersing unit in form of a ring. Therefore all means of the present application are disclosed in each of above mentioned documents.

In conclusion, claims 1 to 8 can not be considered to be new and involving an inventive step.

The industrial applicability is given.